

1
2
3
4
5
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

7 SUZANNE JENNINGS

8 Plaintiff,

9 v.

10 DUKE PARTNERS II, LLC, *et al.*,

11 Defendants.
12
13

Cause No. C17-0969RSL

ORDER IMPOSING SANCTIONS
FOR FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH
LCR 10(e)(9)

14
15 This matter came before the Court *sua sponte*. On July 28, 2017, plaintiff filed a motion
16 which, taken as a whole, exceeded 50 pages in length (Dkt. # 10) but did not provide a courtesy
17 copy for the Court's review as required by LCR 10(e)(9). The Court issued an order requiring
18 immediate delivery of a paper copy of the motion and all supporting documents and an
19 explanation for the failure to comply with the local rules. Dkt. # 13. Plaintiff has failed to
20 provide the courtesy copy: her response suggests that she has no intention of complying with the
21 local rules of this district because she believes the Court has no authority to hear this matter and
22 disputes the validity of the order to show cause.


23 On June 27, 2017, three of the named defendants removed this case to federal court on the
24 ground that plaintiff had inserted a federal Truth in Lending Act ("TILA") claim into her
25 complaint for unlawful detainer. A review of the complaint confirms that plaintiff's claim is, at
26

ORDER IMPOSING SANCTIONS FOR
FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH LCR 10(e)(9)

1 least in part, based on an allegation that defendant Wells Fargo violated TILA. Dkt. # 1-1 at 6-7.
2 Plaintiff has now filed a motion for remand which is not yet fully briefed. In the context of that
3 motion, plaintiff argues that the "Prior Jurisdiction Doctrine" prevents a federal court from
4 assuming jurisdiction over a state unlawful detainer or quiet title action (Dkt. # 10 at 2) but
5 acknowledges that the complaint asserts limited federal issues over which the Court could
6 properly exercise jurisdiction. Dkt. # 10 at 4. At present, therefore, this matter is properly
7 pending in this jurisdiction and -- unless and until the Court grants plaintiff's motion for remand
8 -- the case is governed by the local rules of this district.
9

10 The courtesy copy requirement of LCR 10(e)(9) applies to all litigants whose submissions
11 exceed fifty pages in length. Having declined to provide a courtesy copy as required, the Court
12 will read only the first fifty pages of plaintiff's 1,380 page motion for remand and supporting
13 documents. Future failures to provide courtesy copies in a timely manner will similarly curtail
14 the Court's review of plaintiff's submissions to the first fifty pages.
15

16 DATED this 17th day of August, 2017.
17

18
19 
20 Robert S. Lasnik
21 United States District Judge
22
23
24
25
26